SOME NEW BOOKS.

The lectures on The Old Testament which were delivered during the first three months of the present year in Edinburgh and Glasgow, by Prof. W. ROBERTSON SMITH, are now reprinted by the Appletons. They are of great intrinsic value, constituting, as they do, the most complete exposition in the English language of the problems, methods, and results of Old Testanent criticism. We need not remind the reader hat the publication of similar views in the artieles contributed by Prof. Smith to the Encyclopredia Britannica led to his removal, some weeks ago, by the General Assembly of the Free Church from the chair which he has occupled in Aberdeen College. It is gratifying to learn that this refusal to accept conclusions. as to which almost all Biblical scholars are agreed, was strenuously resisted by more than one-third of the Assembly, and that since his ejection from the professorial chair, Prof. Smith has been requested to accept permanent employment in connection with the Encyclopmia. We propose to outline in this notice the statements and opinious which have given so much offence to the majority of Scottish Presbyterians, but which are not unfamiliar to those who know something of the inquiries prosecuted by such distinguished Semitic scholars as Ewald and Kuenen.

Prof. Smith denies that the results of Biblical criticism set forth in these lectures are based on the rationalistic assumption that the supernatural is impossible, and that everything in the Bible which asserts the existence of a real personal communication of God with man is necessarily untrue. He believes that the supreme truths unfolded in the Jewish Scriptures are things that must abide with us and prove themselves mighty from age to age apart-from all scientific study. But he submits that those who love the truth will not shrink from any toil that will help us to a fuller insight into all its details and all its historical setting; they will remember that "God, who gave us the Bible, has also given us faculties of reason and gifts of scholarship with which to study the Bible, and that the true meaning of Scripture is not to be measured by preconceived notions. but determined as the result of legitimate research. We are reminded that ancient books, com-

ing down to us from a period many centuries before the invention of printing, have necessarily undergone many Some of them are preserved only in imperfect copies made by some ignorant scribe of the dark ages. Others have been disfigured by editors, who mixed up foreign matter with the original text. Very often an important book fell altogether out of sight for a long time, and when it came to light again all knowledge of its origin was gone; for old books did not generally have title pages and prefaces. They often lay in libraries with no note but the author's name, save some words on a slip or tablet easily detached. And when such a roll was again brought into notice, with its title gone, some half-informed reader or copyist was very likely to give it a new title of his own devising, which was handed down thereafter as if it had been original. Or, again, the true meaning and purpose of a book often became obscured in the lapse of centuries, and led to false interpretations. Once more, antiquity has handed down to us many writings which are sheer forgeries In all such cases the work of exposition must necessarily be destructive before it can be constructive; the historical critic must shut off the ceived view in order to disclose a true one. In a word, it is his business to trace back the steps by which any ancient book has been transmitted to us, to find where it came from and who wrote it, to examine the occasion of its composition, and search out every link that connects it with the history of the ancient world and with the personal life of the author.

How was the canon formed according to which Christians recognize certain Jewish writings as invested with peculiar sanctity, as the fruit, indeed, of inspiration, while they reject others as uninspired and apocryphal? We must bear in mind that, as regards the Old Testament, Catholics have one canon and Protestants another. The Council of Trent declared that all books contained in the Latin Vulgate version are canonical, and none other. and that it presents these books in their true text. But several of the books included in the Vulgate translation of the Old Testament, such, for instance, as the books of the Maccabees, are rejected by Protestants. The latter do this on the authority of Jerome himself, the author of the Vuigate version, who, in the prologue to a part of his work. regards all books as apocryphal which he did not translate directly from the Hebrew, and, fo lowing this rule, he excludes from the canon the bees, although he had seen the first of these in Hebrew. The Council of Trent not only accepted all these books as canopical, but various additions to other books-to Ezra, Daniel, and Esther-which are not found in the Hebrew text,

So much just at present for the canon. Now

as to the materials for determining the true text of its constituent writings. The Council of Trent solved the second question by declaring that the Latin Vulgate translation, if not perfect, is, at all events, exempt from errors affecting doctrine. Prof. Smith points out that Jerome himself in his prefaces makes a very different claim for his version. What he says is this: "If you observe my version to vary from the Greek or Latin copies in your hands. ask the most trustworthy Jew you can find, and see if he does not agree with me." It was Jerome's object to improve on the Greek translation called the Septuagint, or version of the Seventy, which was composed in Egypt. and current among the Jews of Alexandria about three centuries before the In many parts of the Old Testament this translation was very obscure. and really did not yield to a natural method of execusis any clear sense. Jerome merely claimed for his version that it agreed with the best Jowish tradition; in other words, he sought to correct the current Bibles of his day (most of which were based upon the Sentuagint) according to the Hebrew text, as the Jews of his time (A. D. 400) received it, and to give an interpretation on a level with the heat Jewish scholarship. He did this partly by the aid of translations from the Hebrew into the Greek. made after the time of Christ, and more in accordance than the Septuagint with the later Rubbinteal scholarship, and partly by the help

of learned Jaws, to obtain which was the special

aim of Jerome's residence in Palestine, As regards textual criticism and interpretation, the Protestant reformers agreed with Jerome in principle. They, like him, aimed only at rendering the text as the best Hebrew holars would do, and to them, as to him, the standard of scholarship was that of the most learned among contemporary Jews. From the time, indeed, when the Old Tes ament was written, down to the sixteenth century there was no continuous tradition of sound Hobrev learning except among the Jewa. The little that Christians knew about the Old Testament at the anothed always come from the Rubbins. This is a point which Prot. Smith urges with much emphasis on the attention of the reader, viz., that the Reformers and their encessors, up to the period when all our Protestant versions of the Old Testament were fixed, were, for all purposes of learning, in the hands of the Habbins, They stopped at that point, simply because the learning of their time also storged there. They went as far as the scholarship of the age would It would be absurd, however, to suppose that the men who refused to accept the authority of C ristian tradition (sanctioned by the Roman Churchi as to the number of books in the canon, as to the best text of the Oid Testament, and as to the principles upon which that text is to be translated, adopted it as a principle. of faith that the Jewish tradition, the unchris tian tradition, handed down to the synngagues of the sixteenth century, upon all these points is final. Luther again and again showed that he submitted to no such authority; and if the Reformers and their first successors did practi-

ish scholarship upon all these questions. they did so merely because these re-suits were in accordance with the best light then attainable. It was left for a later generation of Protestant believers, which "had lost," save Prof. Smith. "the courage of the first lieformers, because it had lost much of their clear insight into divine things," to swear by the Jewish canon and the Massoretic text, as the Romanists swore by the Tridentine canon and the Vulgate text. Scholarship, however, has moved onward since the sixteenth century; and as research has been carried further, it has become plain that it is possible for Biblical students, with the materials still preserved to them, to get behind the Jewish Rabbins, upon whom our Protestant translators were still dependent, and to draw from the stream of Scriptural tradition at a point nearer its source. Prof. Smith explains how this is possible. Long before the time of Christ the Jews had

ceased to speak Hebrew. The language which is called Hebrow in the New Testament was a dialect as unlike to the Hebrew of the Old Testament as German is to English—a different lan-guage, though a kindred one. The language is termed Hebraw in the Evangelical writings, be cause it was spoken by the Israelites then dwelling in Palestine, just as the Spanish Jaws in Constantinople at the present day call their Spanish jargon Hebrew. It was really a kind of Syrine, or Aramnie, which the Jews had gradually learned in place of Hebrew, after their return from the Babylonian captivity, when they found themselves a small handful, living in the midst of nations who spoke Aramaic, and with whom they had constant dealings. For more than five centuries before the birth of Christ Aramaic was the language of business, and of government, just as English is in the Highlands of Scotland, and so the Jews forgot their own tongue and learned Aramaic, as the Scottish Celts are now forgetting Gaelle for English. This process had already gone on to a great extent before the latest books of the Old Testament were completed. Such writers, says Prof. Smith, as the authors of Chronicles and Ecclesiastes write Hebrew in a way which shows that their thoughts often ran in a way not Hebrew, but Aramaic. In some of the later Old Testament books, in Ezra and Daniel for example, there are actually inserted in the Hebrew long Aramaic passages. Before the time of Christ people who were not scholars had ceased to understand Hebrew altogether, and in the synagogue, when the Bible was read, a qualified translator had to rise and give the sense of the passage in the vulgar dialect. It is a significant fact that Jesus himself upon the cross quotes a part of the xxii. Psalm, not from the

Hebrew original, but from a Targum or Aramaic Hebrew, then, at the beginning of our era was a learned language as Latin or Greek is now. acquired, not in common life, but in the school, Moreover, in order to learn Hebrew the young Jew of that time had no grammar, or lexicon. or other written help, but had to rely exclusively on oral instruction. Even to pronounce the text of the sacred writings was to him impossible without his teacher's assistance, since it offered nothing to his eye but a mass of consonants, the vowel marks not having yet been added in the time of Jerome, 400 years after Christ. In a text thus denuded of its vowels the same words might, of course, be often read an 1 interpreted in two different ways. Prof. Smith cites a familiar example in Heb. xi., 21, where we read of Jacob leaning upon the top of his staff; but when we turn to Gen. xivil. 31, we | as completely as any book could be. The profind nothing there about a "staff;" we find bed." The vowels in the two words are different; but as the consonants only were written, it was quite possible for one person to translate our English version of Genesis, following the reading of the Hebrew scribes, and, on the other hand, for the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews to understand it to mean "staff," following the interpretation of the Greek Septuagint. Beyond the bare text. which in this way was often ambiguous, the scribes, as the copyists and expounders of the Hebrew Scriptures were called, had no guide but oral teaching. They had no rules of grammar to go by, since the kind of Hebrew which they themselves wrote ans unlike to the Biblica Hebrew as mediawal law Latin is to Ciceronian) admitted grammatical structions which the old language forhade. When they came to an obsolete word or idiom, they had no guidesto its meaning unless their masters had told them that the pronunciation and the sense were so and so, Now, while admitting that Jewish scholars were exact and retentive learners, Prof. Smith insists that even if the whole of the Bible had been taught word by word in the schools from the day on which each book was first written, it would generations. But, in point of fact, the tradi- earlier than the age of Erra, tional teaching of the Jews was neither co plete, continuous, nor uniform. It was not complete, because there never was nuthoritative interpretation of the whole Bible. It was not continuous, for many expositions which at one time or another had general currency and authority were not received by unbroken tradition from the time when Hebrew became a dead language, much less from the time when the passage was first written, but were devised by the Rabbins out of their own heads. And, finally, the Rabbinical tradition was not uniform; that is to say, the translation, and even the text, of individual passages was often a subject of controversy in the rival schools of the Scribes, different interpretations being at different times in the ascendant The proof of these propositions lies partly in the records of Jewish learning still preserved in the Rabbinical literature, partly in the translations and interpretations made at various times by Jewish scholars or under their guid-

Our Hebrew text of the Old Testament comes down to us from the Scribes; but were they in a position to produce a critical edition which can justly be accepted as the standard, so that we lose nothing by the suppression of all divergent copies? Prof. Smith thinks we should not hesliate to answer this question in the negative. The Scribes were not, in the first instance scholars or preachers, but lawyers. Their objects were legal, not philosophical. Their had system of interpretation made them bad critics. This judgment is confirmed by the accounts given in Talmudical books of certain small and sporadic attempts made by the Scribes to exercise something like criticism on the text. They were governed, it seems, exclusively by the number of manuscripts for or against a given reading, without any reference to the historical or intrinsic merits of the several copies. Such a principle applied upon a large scale would obviously lead to very deplorable results. It is probable that they selected an old and well written copy, possibly one of the manuscripts which were preserved in the Court of the Temple. But though old. the archetypal manuscript could not have comprised original autographs. Of that there are two proofs. In the first place, the manuscript accepted by the Scribes was certainly written with the square, or Chaldean, letters used in our modern Hebrew Bibles. But thes letters are of Aramaic origin, whereas in old times the Hebrows used the quite different character called Phoenician. According to Jewish tradition, which ascribes everything to Ezra (the Scribe par accellence; which it has not the assurance to refer to Moses, the change in the character in which the sacred books was written was introduced by Ezra. We know this to be a mistake, however, for the Samaritans, who did not possess the Pentateuch until fifty yours after Ezra, re ceived it in the old Phoenician letter. Prof. Smith thinks it very doubtful whether there were any manuscripts written in the square Aramaic character before the third century B. C., and that this, therefore, would be the earliour present Hebrew copies.

Another proof that the text accepted by the Scribes was not extraordinarily old lies in | Edom" before there reigned a King of the chilthe spelling. It can be demonstrated that dren of Israel." This would carry us down at the copies

had an older style of orthography than existed in the archetype of our present Hebrew Bibles. We must bear in mind that between the execution of the Sentuagint translation and of a Hebrew text by the Scribes, all the copies of the Scriptures extant in Palestine were threatened with complete destruction. Antiochus Epiphanes (B. C. 163) caused all discoverable manuscripts of the Hebrew law, and seemingly of the other sacred books, to betorn up and burned, and made it a capital offence to possess a Pentateuch, Prof. Smith accounts it fortunate that the Septuagint version, translated at an earlier period, and current in regions where Antiochus had no sway, still exists to carry our knowledge of the state of the text back beyond his time, confirming the substantial accuracy of our Hebrew Bibles, while at the same time showing them to be not immaculate.

But how was the Hobrew text, accepted by the Scribes at the date of the destruction of Jerusa lem, handed down to modern times? Prof. Smith shows us that from the time when their national life was extinguished, the Jews devoted the most strict and punctilious attention to the exact transmission of the received text, down to the smallest peculiarity of spelling. and even to certain irregularities of writing. It is plain that such a system of mechanical transmission could not have been carried out with precision if copying had been left to uninstructed persons. The work of preserving and transmitting the received text became the special function of a guild of technically trained scholars, called the Massorets, or possessors of tradition; that is, of tradition as to the proper way of writing the Bible. The Massorets labored for centuries; their work was not completed for at least 800 years after the time of Christ. The first fundamental fact, then, to be noted, suching the received or Massoretic text, in

which the Hebrew originals of the Old Testament writings have come down to us, is that it cannot possibly be referred to a date earlier than that of Ezra, and should probably be arcribed to a much later period. This is decisively established, to pass over other evidence, by the fact that the very characters-the square Aramaic letters-were not used in Palestine until some time after the return of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon. Let us now inquire what conclusions modern Biblical scholarship has reached concerning the history and substantial value of the writings included in the Old Testament canon. Were the books really written by their reputed authors, and can they be accepted as authentic witnesses to the events they describe? Naturally this inquiry will first concern itself with the origin and purport of the Pentateuch. People who are not accustomed to the methods of Biblical criticism, and who know only that the Levitical law when it first comes on the stage of actual history, at the time of Ezra, presents itself as the law of Moses, are accustomed to say that this assertion of authorship is either literally true or a lie. The Pentateuch, they insist, is either the literary work of Moses, or it is a bare-faced imposture. Prof. Smith thinks that no student conversant with the complicated difficulties of the problem will willingly accept this categorical statement of the question. If we are tied up, however, to make a choice bethese two alternatives, he adtween mits that all the historical evidence which has come down to us points in the direction of the second. If our present Pentateuch was written by Moses, it was lost for many centuries, pnets know the history of Moses and the Patriarchs, but they do not know that complete system of ritual law which the mass of Christian communicants suppose to be his work. In-"bed," as is now the case in | deed, the priests of Shiloh and the Temple do not know the very parts of it which would have done most to raise their authority and influence. At the time of Josiah a book of the Law is found, but it is still not the whole Pentateuch, for it does not contain the Levitical system. From the death of Joshua to Eara is, according to the usual chronology, just one thousand years. Where was the Pentateuch all this time, if it was unknown to every one of those who ought to have had most interest in it? It is plain, Prof. Smith concludes, that no thinking man can be asked to accent the Pentateuch as the literal work of Moses, without some evidence to that effect, But evidence a thousand years after date is no evidence at all when the intervening period bears unanimous witness in a different sense. By insisting that the whole Pentatouch is one work of Moses, and all of equal date, the ditional view cuts off all possibility of proof that its kernel is Mosaic. Prof. Smith finds the true way of escape from skeptical conclusions in another direction, viz., in the affirmance of a Mosaid kernel in the Pentateuch, coupled with the Book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Judith, Tobit, serve all these lessons perfectly through long the substance, must be referred to a date not

The Pentatouch, as we now have it, is not a formal law book, but a history beginning with the creation, and running on continuously into the book of Joshua. Several distinct legal collections are inserted in the historical contents to wit, the primitive legislation unfolded in Exodus, the more elaborate Deuteronomic code and the relatively minute and complicated Levitical ordinances. The three bodies of law are in a certain sense independent of the historical narrative in which they now occur. This is plain enough as regards the legislations set forth in Exolus and Deuteronomy. By many parks, moreover, and particularly by well-dened peculiarities of language, a Levitical doc iment can be culled out from the Pentateuch, containing the whole mass of pricetly legislation and precedents, and leaving untouched the essentially historical part of the five books. As the Pentateuch now stands the two elements of law and history are interspersed, not only in the same book, but often in the same chapter. But originally they were quite distinct.

Even that part of the Pentateuch which may properly be designated as an historical narraive does not itself profess to be written by Moses. It only notes, from time to time, that he wrote down certain special things. These no tices of what Moses himself wrote are so far from proving him the author of the whole Pentateuch that they rather point in the opposite lirection. What he wrote is distinguished from the mass of the text, and he himself is habitually spoken of in the third person. It is ommon to explain this as a literary artifice analogous to that adopted by some Greek and Roman authors; but it is hard to believe that so artificial a way of writing should be as old as Moses, and belong to the earliest age of Hebrew authorship. Prof. Smith asks for proof that any Hebrew ever wrote of himself in the third person, and particularly that Moses should write such a verse as Numbers xii., 3, "The man Moses was very meek above all men living." The idea that Moses author of the whole Pentateuch, except the last chapter of Deuteronomy, is derived from old Jewish theory, set forth by Josephus, that every leader of Israel wrote down, by Di vins authority, the events of his own time, so that the sacred history is like a day book con stantly written up to date. No part of the Bible corresponds to this description, and the Pentasuch as little as any. As for the last chapter of Deuteronomy, which, according to the common hypothesis, is a note added by Joshua to the Mosaic narrative, Prof. Smith points out that this cannot really have been written until after Joshua was dead and gone. For it speaks of the city "Dan," which was the new name given to he city of Laish after the conquest of the Danites in the age of the Judges. But if the last chapter of Deuteronomy is not contemporary history what is the proof that the rest of the book is so? There is not, we are assured, an atom of evidence that the hand which wrote the last chapter had no share in the rest of the book. Prof. Smith does not hesitate to affirm that, as

a matter of fact, the Pentateuchai history was written, not by Moses in the wilderness, but in est date to which we can refer the archetype of the land of Canaan, and not later than the period of the Kings. Repoints out that Genesis axxvl., 31, gives a list of kings who reigned in laid before the translators of the least to the time of Saul; but the probable second the results of contemporary Jew | Septuagint in the third century B. C. often | meaning of the passage is that these kings | has thus disposed the Levitic Paalms of books | Buth. too. is treated by Josephus as a supple-

ruled pefore the land of Edom itself became subject to an Israelite monarch, which brings us down at least to David. An attempt is sometimes made to evade this conclusion by suggesting that certain verses or chapters may be late additions, that the list of Edomite kinus, for instance, and such references to the conquest of Canana as are found in Deuteronomy, are insertions of Egra or some other editor. This, says Prof. Smith might be a fair enough assumption if any post tive proof were forthcoming that Moses wrote the mass of the Pentateuch. In the absence o such proof, no one has a right to call a given passage the insertion of an editor without in ternal evidence that it is in a different style of breaks the context. The moment, however, ref. erence is made to internal evidence it is obvious that we must apply this kind of testimon; consistently and thoroughly; which, as Prof. Smith points out, is a good deal more than those who raised this potent spirit are willing to hear. The proof that the five books commonly

ascribed to Moses were written not in the wil

derness, but in Canaan, does not turn on mere

isolated texts, but lies equally in usages of lan

guage that cannot be due to an editor. In the

Hebrew original of the Pentateuch the common

phrase for westward is "seaward," and for southward "toward the Negeb," the latter word, which primarily means parched land. being the proper name of the dry steppe district on the south of Judah. It is manifest that these expressions for west and south could only be used by people living in Palestine Yet they are used in the Pentatouch not only throughout the course of the narrative, but in the Levitical description of the tabernacle in the wilderness. But at Mount Sinai, the sea did not lie to the west, and the Negeb was to the north. Moses, says Prof. smith, could no more call the south side the Negeb side of the tabernacle than a Glasgow man could say that the sun set over Edinburgh. The answer attempted to this piece of internal evidence is, that the Hebrews might have adopted the phrases used in the Pentateuch in patriarchal times, and continued using them throughout the 430 years during which they abode in the land of Goshen. Prof. Smith does not hesitate to characterize this assumption as nonsense. When a man says "toward the sea" he means it. The Egyptian Arabs say seaward for northward, and so the Israelites must have done when they were in Egypt. To an Arab in western Arabia, on the contrary, seaward means toward the Red Sea. The author of these lectures directs notice also to the fact that the Pentateuch displays an exact topographical knowledge of Palestine (which Moses never entered), but by no means so precise a knowledge of the wilderness of the wandering. The narrator knew the names o the places famous in the forty years' wander ing, but for Canaan he knew local details, and describes them with minute exactitude as they were in his own time. Accordingly the patriarchal sites (of which Moses was supposed to know only by remote tradition) can still be set down on the map with definiteness, whereas geographers are unable to assign with certainty the site of Mount Sinai, because the narrative has none of the topographical color which the story of an eye-witness is likely to possess Again, the Pentateuch quotes as authorities poetical records which could not, at all events be earlier than the time of Moses. One of these documents is a so-called "Book of the Wars of Jehovah:" did Moses, it is asked, writing con temporary history, find and cite a book already current, containing poetry on the wars of Jehovah and his people, which only began in his own times?

Prof. Smith goes on to assign reasons for pelieving that the Pentateuch was not only no written in the wilderness, but is not even in its narrative parts a single continuous work. The first key to the complex structure of the history was found in the use of the names of God in Genesis. It was observed more than a century ago that some parts of Genesis habitually speak of Jehovah, while others as regularly employ the word Elohim. Careful investigation disloses the existence of two independent docu ments which use Elohim, and of a third which ises Jehovah. Moreover, these Eichistic and Jehovistic documents can be traced through the whole Pentateuch, and even to the end of the Book of Joshua. The process by which the three are finally interwoven is illustrated by the parallel narratives of the flood. More striking evidence is furnished by a collation of the legal parts of the Pentateuch. For the details of this inquiry into the various sources of authorship, we must refer the reader to Prof. Smith's book, which itself is only able, in the space at the auther's command, to indicate the main lines and results of Biblical research.

The general conclusion at which Prof. Smith arrives is that while there is reason to believe certain of the laws set forth in the Pentateuch ad been handed down from Moses, yet that taken as a whole, the Levitical logislation exhibited in those five books is the practical adapration of legal principles accepted in the time of Ezra, when Jerusalem was no longer the sent o a free State, but only the centre of a religious community, possessing certain municipal privileges of self-government. In his opinion, the coordination of these principles into a system took place between the time of Ezekiel and the reformatory work of Ears. The fact that the culminating and most sciema ceremony of the great day of expiation was not observed in the year of Ezra's covenant proves, he hinks, that the last touches were not added the ritualistic scheme until after through Exra's agency, it had been put into practi cal operation, While, however, the history al student is thus compelled to speak of the ritual code as the law of the secand temple, it would be a great mistake to think of it as ellogether new. Prof. Smith is careful to point out that Exestel's ordinances re nothing else than a resumping of the old priestly local-a technical term given to ordinances and utterances believed to have been revenled by God. A close study of the La vitical laws shows that many ancient torahs were worked up by successive processes into the complete system which we now possess. The procedure is rendered perfeetly intelligible by the analogy presented in the growth of other primitive systems of jurisprudence. To trace out in detail how much of the Levitical legislation consists of old torahs handed down in antique formulas from time immemorial in the priestly families, and how much was new in the age of Enskiel or of Ezra, is a task which Prof. Smith does not attempt, and which he admits has not yet been fully accomplished by scholars. It is clearly, however, an historical function to determine how far the Levitical law is more law. of which we can say no more than that it was law for the second temple, and how far it is also history which can be used in describing the original sanctuary of the ark in the days of

Mones. When were the Psalms written, and by whom were they composed? It is now generally ac knowledged that the Psaiter contains some pooms of the period of David, and others that were written during the Babylonian exile, if not later, thus embracing within its compass empositions whose dates are at least 500 years apart. The collection was not made with an historical, but with a liturgical object, and the lyrics are preserved in a hymn book specially adapted for the the second temple. It is noteworthy that of the poems embodied in the historical books only one, viz., the eighteenth Psalm, is preserved in the Psaiter. The first of the five books into which, in the Hebrew texts, the Psaims are divided, is a formal collection of hymns ascribed to David. Whether any of these poems were really written by David is a question about which the most trustworthy authoritie differ, Ewald maintaining the affirmative and Kuenen the negative. In the second book the poems ascribed to David form a connected group apart from the Korahitic and Asaphate Psalms, though including some anony pieces. In book third only the eighty-sixthPsalm bears the name of David, and this title is pronounced unquestionably a mistake. Prof.

Smith submits that it cannot be accident which

L-III. in two groups. If the final collector had gathered these poems together for the first time he would surely have made one group, not two, and the conclusion is that the first book once existed as a separate collection. Another indication that the first three books of the Psalter contained collections formed by more than one editor lies in the names applied to God. Books one, four, and five use the name of God in the same way as do most other parts of the Old Testament where Jehovah is the prevalling term, and other names, such as Elohim, occur less frequently. But in the greater part of books second and third the name of Jehovah is rare, and Eichim takes its rlace, even where the substitution reads very awkwardly. The inference from this and other facts mentioned by Prof. Smith is, that the Elohim Psalms were formed by an editor, who, for some reasons, preferred to suppress, as far as possible, the name of Jehovah. The general result of the analysis to which they have been subjected reduces the five books of the Psalms to three The first collection (identical with our Book I.), which from every point of view proclaims itself the oldest consists of Davidic Psaims; the second (comprising books two and three) is made up of Elohistic Psalms; thethird (which includes the books now numbered four and five) contains the latest Pasims, mainly written from the first with a liturgical purpose.

Touching the age of these three collections, Prof. Smith considers that most of the Psalms in the third group, are certainly late, not only in collocation but in authorship. He would refer some of them to a date subsequent to the reorganization of the theocracy by Ezra and Nehemiah, when the temple service of song was specially provided for. The second collection contains poems said to have been sung by the 'sons of Korah" and the "sons of Asah," by which names two guilds of temple singers were res sectively designated. While this second collection undoubtedly embodies some older Psalms, it cannot, as a whole, be ascribed to a period earlier than the age of Ezra and Nehemish. Some of the poems, indeed, point strongly to the much later time when the Seleucid Kings sought to put down the spiritual religion of Israel by force, and restore the worship of

false Gods. We come now to the first collection which, in the received Hebrew text, stands by itself as a separate Psaim book. Here every Psaim, with a few exceptions, is attributed to David. Many considerations, however, are cited by Prof. Smith to show that the titles cannot be accepted as an authoritative part of the text. The conclusive argument is that David certainly did not write some of the pieces ascribed to him in the first Psalm book. Thus in Psalm xxxiv, the title speaks of Abimelech as King of Gath in the time of David. In reality Abimelech was a contemporary of Abraham, and the King of Gath in David's time was named Achish. Again. several of the Psalms in the first book allude to a temple on Mount Zion, in which the singer expresses a desire to live continually. But the house of God at Zion in David's time was not a temple, but a tent. There had been a temple at Shiloh, but it was destroyed. The date at which this first collection was formed can hardly be assigned with precision. The other two primitive books, as we have said. were put together after the time of Ezra, but this contains no poem which demands so recent a date. Prof. Smith does not overlook the fact that in the second collection there are, besides the Korahite and Asahie hymns, some ascribed by their titles to David. But he cannot find sufficient ground for attributing to David the authorship of a single Psalm in the second collection.

In general it might be said that the titles of the poems contained in the Psalter would be authoritative if they were as old as the Psaims. Some of them, however, are the mere conjectures of individual copyists, and even in the collection of poems assigned to David, there is no proof that the titles express a tradition earlier than the date at which the group was formed. It is true that the earliest Psalm book (which in the received text figures as Book I.) was accepted in the Jewish Church as a Davidic hymnal. But this opinion was not based on authentic knowledge that every Psaim in the collection was really David's, for some of the poems are certainly of later date. The tradition merely expressed an opinion that David was closely connected with the early psalmody of Israel. There is little direct evidence in the old Hebrew literature to support even this conviction. In the books of Samuel, the King is never lost in the Paulmist as is the case in the current conception of David's life. When we learn, indeed, that the two hymns in H Samuel. xxii., xxiii., are apparently foreign to the original context of the parrative, it may appear doubtful whether the oldest story of his life described David as a usalmist at all.

The three main divisions of the Old Testa-

ment are commonly designated as the Law, the Paulms, and the Prophets; we proceed to note some of the problems suggested by the historical and prophetical books, and the solutions offered by modern Biblical criticism. From the inquiries pursued in the chapter devoted to this opie, Prof. Smith excludes the Book of Joshua. because this in all its parts hangs closely together with the Pentateuch, and must have received at the same epoch its present literary form. The difficulties which it presents are identical with the books of Moscs, and are only ex plicable by a critical analysis of the Jewish law. He excludes also the narrative of Chronicles, which was indisputably written long after Erra's reformation, and has in no sense the character of a primary source for the earlier history The earlier historical books, from Judges to Kings, bring down the history of the Jewish nation in continuous form to the captivity, and received their final shape soon after that event The great mass, however, of the records which they embody is of much earlier date. Prof. Smith shows that they are in part based on official annals, with waich other materials were from time to time incorporated. In the books of Kings, for instance, critics are accustomed to distinguish the framework of the parrative from the details subsequently inserted. We have, on the one hand, a brief epitome of public affairs, coupled with moral judgments on each sovereign, which runs through the whole work in close connection with chronological data, and sooms to be based on the royal annals constantly cited as the original authority. On the other hand, we encounter a variety of episodes and picturesque passages which are but loosely connected with the general plan, and which, in many cases, cannot have been culled from any collection of official records. This view, founded on a scrutiny of the internal features of the book, finds support in the nature of external evidence from the oldest version. In the Septuagint certain episodes of the history are removed to another place, as if at the time this translation was made they stood apart from the general structure of the narrative. Among the passages which are differently recounted in Septuagint and in the Massoretic text, may be mentioned the story of David and Goliath, told in the first Book of Samuel. There seems to be no doubt that here an interpolation became firmly fixed in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. So, too, the account of the gradual progress of Saul's hostility to David, given in Septuagint, is much more consistent and probable than that which has come down to us in the Massoretic manuscripts. Something should be said touching the dates

ascribed to the several documents comprising the Haglographa, a name given to those writings which, while elothed with more or less sanctity, had no place in the synagogue service until a comparatively late period. Some of the Hagiographa sustain the test of old currency. It does not appear that the sacred character of the Book of Job was over challenged, although its composition cannot be referred to a date older than the time of Jeromiah. The only trace of a discussion about the sacredness of the Proverbs is found in a late Jewish book, and in a form which commands little credence, The Proverbs, however, were compiled after the return from Babrion, and represent the current proverbial sayings of that epoch. The Book of Lamentations seems to have passed, in the time of Josephus, as an appendix to Jeremiah.

ment to Judges. The Book of Ezra-Nehemiah was received by the Alexandrian Jews only in the form of a midrash or popular parabhrase, with many fabulous additions, and a text arbitrarily mangied. The Chronicles, according to all appearances, once formed one, book with Ezra and Nehemiah, from which they have been so rudely torn that II. Chronicles now ends in the middle of a verse, which reappears complete at the beginning of Esra. But the Chronicles now stand after Ezra-Nehemiah, as if it were now stand after Ezra-Nehemiah, as if it were an afterthought to admit them to equal authority. Of Ezekiel, we read in the Taimud that "but for Hananiah, son of Hezekiah, they would have suppressed the Book of Ezekiel, where the suppressed the Book of Ezekiel, where the book of Ezekiel, the form of a midrash or popular paraphrase, measures of oil, and he sat down and explained it." Some German critics are disposed to hold that the scholar who reconciled Ezekiel with the Pentateuch at such an expenditure of midnight oil was really Eliszar, son of Hananiah.

ENGLISH LUNCHEONS.

Pro- Herper's harry.

Gregory of Nazianzus still omit Esther from the canon. As to Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon, these books were controverted among orthodox Jews up to the very end of the first Christian century.

While discussing the date and authenticity of certain Old Testament writings, Prof. Smith takes occasion to correct two misconceptions which at one time or another have extensively prevailed. Among the nacient Pathers it was a current opinion that Ezra himself rewrote by inspiration the whole Old Testament, which had been destroyed or injured at the time of the captivity. The source of this opinion is a fability rewrite the law which had been turned. His prayer was granted, and retiring for forty days with five scribes to write to his dictation, he produced 94 books. "And when the forty days were completed the Most High spake, saying, Publish the first books which thou hast written, that the worthy and the unworthy may read them; but conserve the iast seventy and deliver them to wise men of thy people." To understand why his injunction was ascribed to Jehovah we must remember that these looks of the first Christian century, it would be necessary to meet the objection that it had never been known before. Accordingly, he and other Hellenistic forcers of the same period fell back on the assertion that certain of the sacred writings had always been essorted books, confined to a privileged circle. The whole fable is directed to this end, and is previously about the mean started up in the sixteenth century, and gained amost under the control of the sacred writings had always been essorted by a body of men known as the Great Synagogue. This Groat Synagogue plays a considerable part in Jewish tradition, being representations of the same period fell back on the assertion that certain of the sacred writings had always been essorted by a body of men known as the Great Synagogue. The first profit is the first the first proposal to the self-them to wise and anothem to the presidency of Ezra, wiending supportant the presidency

the later Jaws. We know, of course, from Nehmiah, that Exra did establish a canon—that is, led his people to accept a written and sacred code as the absolute rule of faith and life. But this canon of Exra was the Pentateuch.

In view of the results of, textual and exegeited in the companies of the propounded in Prof. Smith's leader rules, it must be acknowledged that the theory

of verbal inspiration, so far as that hypothesis has been applied to the Old Testament, seems the plate, are placed before the guests; upon those are asynthe dissect thild and fors and a silver pick. If note are on the table, when lees are given, at mass beeplate matching the flager bow is placed upon the china plate, and a special accumulation the flager bow is placed upon the china plate, and for, when the lee is brought round, the guest removes the spoon, &c, and its out the decrey and towly which he biness are do his plant. After down an additional the decrey and towly when he comes are do his plant. After down a full servants pines the deep teps of various wines, spirite, &c, on the table in front of the hest, and leave the room, and after a bacterior of shorter period the party broads up, gentlemen and indicated the plant, and after a bacterior and in the first in the first afternoon engagement is approaching, and they must exposite their moments. These who do remain to the drawing room, as the line for alternoon engagement is approaching, and they must exposite a factories from members before taking their departure, clocking themselves in the half to one leading. to be scarcely tenable. It was mainly on this ground that the author was removed from his professorial chair by the General Assembly of the Free Church. Now, however, that this body has seen fit to take such peremptory netion, it behooves them to set about a business which, in the opinion of a good many observers, should first have engaged their energies. Let them prove that Prof. Smith's methods of Biblical criticism are unsound, his applications of them faulty, and his conclusions untrustworthy. They must not neglect this task, for they, in their turn are now on trial before the community at large, If they succeed in refuting his assertions, they will relegate Prof. Smith to the obscurity from thich it is dangerous for sciolists to emerge. Should they fail, they will leave him in a posiion to say with Galileo, " Despite the decision of your tribunal, the world moves."

M. W. H. TRYING TO KILL FATHER O'RORKE.

A Lunatic Under the Hallucination that the Priest was his Evil Genius. SCRANTON, Pa., June 18 .- Patrick Reilly. who on Sunday last attempted to take the life f Father O'Rorko while the latter was celebrating mass in the Catholic Church in Olyphant, a mining hamlet on the Delaware and Hudson road, about five miles from here, is confined in the Lackawanna County prison in this city. Reilly is a young man of lithe frame, with a shock of glossy black hair covering his emples. He has for several years intered under the ballucination that Father O'Rorke is: his evil genius. In 1879 he made an attempt on the priest's life with a revolver. At that time he was sent to the Danville Hospital for the Insane, from which place, at the request of his friends, he was recently released on the ground that his reason had been fully restored, He thinks that as long as Father O'Rorke lives in Olyphant he can have no peace, and that if the could put the priest out of the way his happiness would be complete. On Sunday morning last he sent for the priest under the pretence that he was in need of spiritual consolation, but I stater O'llorke, knowing the man's realised to respond. This exasperated fashly, and leading up his gun with a viscon carridges—it is a Spenour repeating rib—his strode off toward the Catablic course, watch be entered while the mest solomn parties of the mass was being colebrated. On reaching the door he paused a moment, removed his his and then pushed his way through the cycle and up the aisis to the altar railing. The presence of a man with a gan in his hand naturally startled the consregation, but when he presented to take aim at the press the exceptance of a man with a gan in his hand naturally startled to the consregation, but when he presented to take aim at the press the exceptance in the commoder, and the scart is represented as having been a trifling inc. Soveral women and children were hurt during the commoder, and the scart is represented as having been a trifling inc. Soveral went in the act of raising his gun to his shoulder, and after a sharp straigh disarrated him. Another minute and he would have killed the priest in his robes on the altar. A local magnificate issued a commitment, and the heart of Forke intends to push the matter as far as the law with permit, since he is in constant period by his parant, since he is in constant period by heart altar as he could put the priest out of the way his happi-

first entered the church door as the congre-gation was faced toward the attar, and could not then have seen or hindered him. He is a dead shot, and has frequently won prizes in local shooting matches. Taking the Law into his Own Hands.

From the Stemmath News. From the Samson Area.

Simon Johnson, a little colored chicken thiof about Councy, captured an old hen from Jack Rethinson one wight fast week and sold it for five cents. Jack for wind of it said led Simon off to the awamp, where he administered to his bare back fitty lastics.

if necessary, must be sent immediately on receipt of the invitation, in order that fresh invitations may be issued by the histers; honce the trade in gate of refusals, the second issue giving two weeks notice, as it enables her to fill her table in gate of refusals, the second issue giving two weeks notice. In London, where the men are a telsure during the day, the guests are of both sexes in equal proportions. Men go in morning dress, cut-away boats, &c. Ladies war visiting costumes, and retain their honnes. Usually a loose outer mands is worn, which is taken off in the entrance hall, and for with the footman. There are two or more men servants as required by the size of the party, a buffer and two footmen being sufficient for a luncheon of eighteen. After your wrap is removed, the huter precedes you up stairs, after sating your name, opens the drawing room dor, and announces. Mr. and Mrs. Blank, in a distinct voice—not. Mrs. and Mr., is we have twice heart done by uninstructed servants, who doubtless wished to be "patte to the lady" Your hostess greets you apen jour entrance, and after a few remarks intraduces you to the kentleman next to whom you are to sit attable, but no other introductions are made, unless by special request. When all the guests are assembled, where the number is large, the hostess often asks each gentleman to take down the lady whose seat is next to his at table; toomed it is more correct a function on the his section it is more correct a function on the host so often asks each gentleman to take down the lady whose seat is next to his at table; the hostess often asks each gentleman to take down the lady whose seat is next to his at table; toomed it is more correct a function not be in see formal as a diamed on one side, is usually put by each place, and out to them; this, though it sounds confusing, is not so in reality.

The table is set procisely as for dimer, and With regard to Daniel, two facts point to late admission into the canon. Daniel is not mentioned among the worthies in Ecclesiasticus. and here again the Septuagint has a text encumbered with legendary additions. The Palestinian Talmud still contains traditions of opposition to its introduction, and it is a notable circumstance that not only is the book freely handled in the two Greek recensions of the text, but even the Targums, or Aramsic paraphrases, use an unwonted purely romancing additions. The Book of Esther was not undisputed in the early Christian Church, and, according to Eusebius, a Bishop of Sardis in the middle of the second century journeyed as far as Palestine to ascertain the Jewish canon of his time, and brought back a list from which Eather was excluded. In the fourth century, Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzus still omit Esther from the canon. As to Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon, these books were controverted

Americans who have not been long in London chasing after a piece of lish with fork and bread, their flas knife lidy reposing beside their plate, they thinking it a dessert knife. The English also use the ordinary knife and fork differently from Americans, as Charles Reade has already notified. Here the fork is never changed to the right hand. Vegetables and such tiongs are curred to the mouth by the fork in the light hand catting the meat and along in putting the vegetables on the fork hand; these such as sweetbreads, croquettes, and such soft dishes, are eaten with the lord mone, and it is then used by the right hand; but where knife and fork are employed, their pinets insver laid down in order to take the latter in the right hand. Pudding, jelles, crouns, e.e., are eaten with a fork wong at all possible tough sometimes forth fork and spoon (which are a ways sented as a permanent council under the presidency of Ezra, wielding supreme authority over the Jewish nation. But the Hebrew tradition never said that the Great Synagogue fixed the canon; that opinion was a mere conjecture of a Jewish scholar contemporary with Luther. Not only so. but we now know that the whole idea that there ever was a body called the Great Synagogue holding rule in the Jewish nation is pure fiction. Everything that is told about it. except what we read in Nehemiah, is a fable of the later Jews. We know, of course, from Ne-

> themselves in the half before leaving themselves in the half before leaving themselves in the half before leaving. THE GREEK BRIGANDS OF TO-DAY. Superstition and Reperturences of the Bands. Artstition

> From the Live on Divily Brief. The whole of the band of Greek brigands

charm he were into several men swore to the truth of the above story.

One or two stories as related to Mr. Suterby the game routed their evening men so 7 their fundally. The chart of the last of the story of the

and finally, he mit has him from telling takes these fragments in a loo walk to the neares!

The Army Worm.

In southern Dutelless county. New worm is doing great damage to vegetat tomate and encumber plants.